172-92

G. R. S. IX-5

Previous references.

1891-92

192 .

(LR)

File No. 160

Serial Nos.

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

Serial Nos.

Part B for

SUBJECT.

Appeal of Hanumaiah alias Hanumantacharlu Hormavi Taluk, praying that he may be Confirmed as Patel of Hirebagur

To. The Deputy Commr Shimoga &c.

No. 724 S. 17.7.1893. LR 160-91-92.

P.R. 172-92.

Declining to interfere with the order of the Deputy Commr regarding the dismissal of the appeal of Hanumaiah for Patelship of Hirebagur.

WD 2233—GPB—20,000—11-6-20

Precis

A. S. No. 211 of 1891-92

Hanumia alias
Hanumanthia
versus
1 Rungappa
and others

(1) In March 1871 the Amildar of Honnali at the request of one Seekappa the hukdar Patel of Hirebasur who had been then old and unfit for managing the Patel duties, recommended that his eldest son Hanumia× might be appointed Patel and as the latter was illiterate one Hanumanthia (appellant) son of the said Seekappa's younger brother might be directed to officiate as gumastha.

13. 3. 72 The Deputy Commr. thereupon directed the Amildar to allow Hanumanthia to do the duties pending orders of the Divn. Superintendent.

(Vide Dy Commrs letter.) (What further order was passed in the case is not clear, since the Deputy Commr says, in his letter to this office, that the records have been destroyed)

× also named Dodda Hanumia

Genealogical tree



(2)

On the 3d January 1890 Ranyia grandson of the above named Seekia presented a petition to the Asst Comr Shimoga that formerly the Kumbli lands and the Patelship of Hirebasur had been in the enjoyment of Seekia, that afterwards the said lands and the Patelship had been in the enjoyment of his father Dodda Hanumappa, that after the death of the said Dodda Hanumappa the lands had been register-ed in his name, that since he had been a minor, Hanumanthappa above named had been appointed to officiate as gumastha, though the kararnama had been made out in his name only, and that as his younger brother Giriyappa was 20 years old and further fit to manage the Patelship duties, he might be appoint-ed Patel.

The Amildar was thereupon directed to submit a detailed report of the case.

(3)

10·1·90

Hanumia appellant son of Giriyappa presented a petition to the asst Commr Shimoga Dist that during the life-time of his senior uncle Seekappa the Pateli had been registered in the name of the said Seekappa's son Hanumia and he appellant had been directed to officiate as gumastha, that since then he had been doing the duties, that Rungappa grandson of Seekappa had presented a petition that he should be appointed as Patel, that the said Rungappa was illiterate and that he (appellant) might be ordered to continue as gumastha.

(3)

11·1·90

The amildar was thereupon directed to dispose of the case and if necessary to submit a report.

The amildar held an enquiry into the case.

(4)

5·3·90

Rungappa above named son of Dodda Hanumappa gave the following statement before the amildar:

" The Pateli of this village had been registered in the name of my grand-father Seekappa.

After his death the bara
. vard was made out in
the name of my father.
He was illiterate and
therefore his uncle Girijappa's
son Hanumanthappa
had been directed to
officiate for him in in
1872. He has been since
then doing the duties. I
was then a minor. Now
I have attained majority
and can do the duties.
My younger brother Girijappa
is able to manage the duties.
The baravard should be
ordered to be made out
in his name or in my name
only."

Girijappa stated as (5)
follows:-
"Since 1872 Girijappa's
son Hanumanthappa
has been doing the duties.
We were then young. Now
we are able to manage
the duties. The baravard
should be ordered to be
made out in my name
or in the name of my elder
brother Rangappa."

Hanumanthia appellant 7-3-90
son of Girijappa states
as follows:-

The Patels of this village
have been registered in the
name of Seekia my father's
elder brother. About 20
years ago after the death

of the said Seekia the
Govt held an Enquiry
into the claims of Dodda
Hanumanthia, Son of the
said Seekia, to be made
the bar uvaddar.

(6) Seekia had effected
a settlement that the
Pateli ~~deceased~~ should
go to the share of his
younger brother Girijappa's
family. I have been
accordingly appointed. I
was not appointed as
gumastha. The Khata
for umbli lands stands
in accordance with the
settlement made by our
elders. Rungappa is not
entitled to the Pateli."

(7) The Amildar thereupon
submitted a report that
22. 8. 80 since 1872 Hanumanthia
(appellant) had been
doing the duties as gumastha
that there was nothing
to be found in the records
in support of the said
Hanumanthias ~~allegation~~ allegation
that a partition had
formerly been effected
according to which the
umbli lands had to go
to one branch of the
family and the Pateli
to the other branch, that
the said Hanumanthia

had been appointed
as gumastha only & that
the Potgi varavard showed
that Seekappa was dead
that his son Hanumia
was appointed his successor
and that his gumastha
was Hanumanthia. He further reported
that Rungappa and his
two brothers did not
appear fit to manage
the Patel duties, that
Hanumanthia (applt.)
had been for the past
20 years managing the
duties satisfactorily, that
in fact there was nothing
to deprive the said
Rungappa of his hak
to the office and that
under these circum-
-stances it would not
in his opinion, be just
to deprive Hanumanthia
(applt.) of his gumastha
-ship."

The Deputy Commr ordered (7)
that the matter might
be placed before the
Huzur-jamabandi 5-9-90
officer & that final
orders might be obtained
from him.

The jamabandi officer (8)
observing that it did
not appear from the
genealogical tree that
Rungappa & his brothers

had any link to the
office, ordered the amildar
to submit a report as
to when the umbli land
came to Rungappa's
2-1-91 possession and also
with regard to other
particulars.

The Amildar sub-
-mitted the statements
given by the holders of
the umbli lands and
reported that the said
statements showed that
both Rungappa and
Hanumanthia appellant
had been enjoying some
shares in the umbli land.

The said statements
28-1-91 given by the holders of the
umbli land, before the
(9) amildar ~~stated~~ mention
that the umbli lands
attached to the Patel
of Hirebasur are in the
enjoyment of several
hissedars that there are
two khatés for the lands
- one standing in the name
of Rungappa son of Giriappa
and another in the name
of Rungappa, (1st Respt.) son of Dodda
Hanumappa above named
that both the appellant
and the 1st Respondent
Rungappa have got

some shares in the said umbli lands.

The Deputy Comm^r issued an order to the Amildar to send the records in connection with order no 130 of 13.3.1872, and to report as to what had become of the Pukka Polgi Registers. 19.2.91 (10)

The Amildar thereupon submitted his report that the records of 1872 referred to above had been submitted to the Dist^t office along with the Amildar's report no 158 of 26.5.72, and that the Polgi Register was not to be found in his office records. 31-8-91 (11)

On the 11th September 1891 the Deputy Comm^r held an Enquiry into the case. (12)

Rungappa 1st Respt^t gave the following statement:-

" The Patels of Hirebasur had been registered in the name of my grandfather Seekappa. He had requested Govt to make my father Baragandar. I do not know writing. The Baragand should be made out in the name of my younger brother

Giriappa and Hanumanth-appa who is now doing the duties should be ordered to do the duties for one year more, as the said Giriappa has yet no experience of the work."

Giriappa & his ~~both~~ younger brother Thimmappa also stated to the above effect.

Hanumanthappa appellant stated he had been doing the Patel duties for a long time and that he would not agree to officiate as gumastha only for one more year and then hand over charge to the karnavardar.

(13)

The Deputy Commr. thereupon ordered that it was not proper to have failed to transfer the karnavard so long although many years had passed since the death of Seekappa & Dodda Hanumappa, that the karnavars should therefore be made out in the name of Giriappa son of Dodda Hanumia and grandson of Seekappa, that the said Giriappa ~~should be~~ appointed on probation for one year & that after the Expiry of one year a report should be made as regards his qualifications

that Hanumanthia (appellt) should be removed. The Dy Comm^r states in his order that Hanumanthia had refused to continue doing duties as gumastha for another year as desired by the hukdar.

The appeal is against this order.

Hanumanthia appellant alleges :-

(1) that a partition had been formerly effected according to which the Patel came to his share.

(2) that in the Potgi settlement of 1878 he was registered as Patel.

(3) that he has been doing the Patel duties for the last 30 years.

H.C.M. On 23.9.92 the Dy Comm^r was requested to send the records of 1872 relating to the appointment of appellant as gumastha of Dodda Hanumia or certify that the records have been destroyed.

The Dy Comm^r replies that the Rev^e Record keeper has certified that the records of 1872 referred to above have been destroyed, that the Pukka Potgi Settlt records are not forthcoming, although a careful search was made, & that the amildar has reported that apparently nothing was recorded at the Pukka Potgi Settlt about the office in question

26.1.93

H.C.M.

(continuation)

In this office no. 17482 dated 24th Sept 1892 April 1893 the Supt. of Survey was requested to send the records relating to the settlement of the Potgi of the patel of Hirebasur.

The Survey Supt. has complied with the request.

No. 1089 dated 4th May 1893 from the Supt. Rev. Survey

Under the head "names and shares" in column no. 4 of statement 5, are mentioned

" 1 Rungia bin Hanmappa
2 Rungia and Giriappa "

The patel Register for 1874 of malloor magani said to have been received from the Taluk ~~office~~ gives the name of Seekia as the registered patel of Hirebasur and the name of Hanmanatha ~~as~~ Gumastha as the person actually doing the duty.

The Patel Kumbi statement of 1886 of the village of Hirebasur gives under the head "Vatandars" the names of "Rungia bin Hanumappa, Rungia and Giriyappa"

KCh

A. S No. 211 of 1891-92
Hanumia alias
Hanumanthia
versus
Ningappa & others.

Memo:

One Seekappa was the hukdar Patel of Hirebasur in Honnali Taluk. In 1871 he requested the authority that his son Dodda Hanuma might be made the baravardar and that as the said Dodda Hanuma was illiterate his (Seekappa's) younger brother's son Hanumanthia (appellt) might be directed to do the duties.

In 1872 the Dy Comr ordered that pending the Divl Supts orders, the appellant might do the duties.

Anyhow Dodda Hanuma Succeeded his father and the appellant was doing duties as his gumastha.

Dodda Hanuma also died afterwards. The Respondents are his

(Vide amildar's report of 22.8.90) not supported by Kaifiyats.

three sons.

The eldest by the 1st Respt Rungappa is illiterate. In 1890 he moves the authorities that his younger brother Giriappa might be appointed Patel and that the appellant might be removed.

The appellant represented to Govt that a partition had been effected in the life time of Seekappa above named in accordance with which the Patelship fell to his share and the inmbli lands to Respondents, and that he had been doing the Patel duties ~~since 1892~~ for the past 20 years.

The Amildar reported to the Dy Commr that it would be unjust to remove the appellant who had been doing the Patel duties for the past 20 years, that there was nothing in the records to support the appellant's allegation that a partition

had been effected, and that he had been appoint-ed only as qum as tha.

The Deputy Comm.r held an Enquiry into the case in September 1891 and ordered that Giriappa 2d respondt. should be appointed Patel on probation for one year, & that the appellant Hanumanthi should be removed from the office.

Hanumanthi has appealed to this office against the above order.:

He alleges:-

That a partition had been formerly effected in accordance with which the Patelig of Hirebasur fell to his share.

That in the Potgi settlement of 1878 he was registered as Patel.

That he has been doing the duties for a very long time.

P.C.K.

(P. T. O.)

On 23-9-92 the Dy Comm^r was requested to send the records of 1892 relating to the appointment of appellt as gumastha.

The Dy Comm^r in reply to the above states that 26-1-93
the Rev. Std Record Keeper has certified that the records of 1892 refd to above have been destroyed, that the Pukka Potgi settlt records are not forthcoming, although a careful search has been made, and that the Amildar has besides reported that apparently nothing was recorded at the Pukka Potgi settlt about the office in question.

BCh
24-3-93

(Continued)

The Survey Supt. was requested in this office No. 17482/172-92 of 24-4-93 to send the Potpi settlement records of Hirebasur village.

The Survey Supt. has accordingly sent up these records:

In a statement shewing the distribution of Potpi &c. of Hirebasur the names of "1 Rungia bin Hanumappa 2 Rungia & Giriappa" are mentioned under the head "names & Shares".

The Patel Rejistr for 1874 of malloor magani mentions Seekia as the registered Patel of Hirebasur and Hanumanthia, Umasta as ~~Guma~~ Gumastha the person actually doing the duty.

The Patel umbli statement of 1886 of Hirebasur mentions "Rungia bin Hanumappa Rungia & Giriappa"

(12)

Revenue Appeal No: 211 of 1891-92

Appt.	Respts.
Hanumanttra	Rungappa Giriappa

Decision. In March 1871. Seekappa the Inchtar Patel of Hirehastur, Hirnali Taluk gave up his office owing to old age and recommended that his eldest son Hanumiah who was illiterate might be appointed Patel & that his younger brother's son Hanumantiah might be appointed to do duties as Gymastah. Hanumiah died leaving two minor sons the respondents. The latter on attaining majority claimed the office and the Dr Comr of Dharwar thereupon ordered that Hana Appt. Hanumantiah be removed from office & that respondent Giriappah should be appointed Patel on probation

A Hanumanta was accordingly ordered to do duties pending further orders.

in 1891

Hanumantiah appeals on
the ground that he was
doing those duties as Hukdar
in his own right in pursuance
of a partition under which
Patel Seekappa his paternal
uncle made over the Patelki
to him & not as Gumasta.
The point for decision is
whether appt did duty
as Gumasta or as Hukdar
In a petition dated 10/1/190
Hanumantiah states as
follows "my adoptive
Seekappa during his life-
time, about 1872 gave
a petition + same deposition
his son should be appointed
Patel + that the duties
should devolve upon me
as Gumasta. In
accordance with the
same, ever since, I have
been doing the duties."
Now Seekappa's grandson
Rungappa has petitioned
to the effect that the
office should be conferred
on him & taken away
from me. He does not

1 presented personally to the
Samasthanadhy officer.

Write. Seckappah has
deposed that my
Gumastaship should
never be taken away."
Her evidence only shows
that appt was doing duties
not as Huckoor but as
gumasta to the late father
of R Respt. Now is
therefore no reason to
set aside the order of
the Dy Coll appealed
against. The appeal
is rejected.

20/6/[illegible]

Read

Mr Espinasse states that his
appeal has been dismissed
as there is no reason for
setting aside the order of
the Dy Coll. Appt, according
to his own admission was
a gumasta & not a Huckoor
Patail.

21/6/[illegible]

(General Serial No. 32.)

1892.

No. 4618 (2)

Name of Petitioner. C. Y. Ramanna & others
C. Y. Ramanthia

Village. Chik Bagur

Taluk. Hosmali

District. Shimoga

Date of Arzi. 8-12-91

Date of Receipt. 16-4-92

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures.

Appeal within time
Call for rec.
JP.
8/6/92

A 160-91 1

ABSTRACT.

This is an appeal against
the order of the Assistant Commr
Nagar Shimoga District, dated
15-9-91.

Ramanda for Appellant
One Rangappah was the
first man who was appointed
as Patel of Chikkaur Village.
The Appellant is the grandson
of the above named Rangappa
and the respondents are the
great grandsons. Under the

Head of the Rangpjaw;
one Sirdarjeeah has elected
how and their duties of
Appointed Patwari was
appointed as Head of Shire-
Bacca Village, but owing
to his inefficiency and want
of experience the Appointment
has not Continued to work
as Head of the said Village
from the year 1870. In the
year 1872 Sirdarjeeah made
an application with a request
that the office would be
transferred to Devis d'ans
main his election (father
of the Respondent) and
that the Appointment to work
as Gumashta, but his request
were not granted by the then
Deputy Commissioner who at
the same time recommended to
the Division Commissioner
for vacancy of the Appointment
name as Head of the
Village. About the year
1873

as to the qualification of the men by appointed man.

Militia and are raised during the January of this year.

Arrangements also — Arrangements the general Militia must be summoned from the Office. The two Regiments here to January of this year.

Strength there are to find to Militia Summoned by — Enquiries, Circular, and Summoned, the appointment of Circular has Secured the Consent of the Militia has not been Settlement.

Is a Question that was Executed between the Spiritual and the Regiments in order it was said when the Militia must be removed to the Office and that the Militia had not Enough of Arrangements and has was duly appointed by Militia Summoned (Militia of the Regiments) and Some Summoned the Militia. Militia Summoned and Summoned this in the year 53-54.

The Regiments in no way injured the Spiritual as regards the Regiments not this day being any Complaint for

for the removal of the to the Counties of Simcoe
Middlesex, from the Office, Caing, Rent. & Expenses
thereof a period of 3-4 years. &c.
Carried since the date of the Settlement thereof
of Dunnville;

Be it therefore resolved by present Govt. Assembly
the Counties and Gaol-Committees of Simcoe are
hereby Office in said Counties extended.
be Caing proved that the Settlement is the Permanent Assembly
proper Claimant to the be left encircled thereof
Office after and that it is a long time the
that it has Experience Assembly of Surveyors
endured his service and his after all the
a long period of 3-4 years. Dunnville.

Therefore the Petitioner it is duly entitled
Counties from the Caing the Gaol and
sole of the Office Dunnville Counties
Commissioners may be proved, and be
ex-officio and the Petitioner appointed to the Office
Confirmed as Clerk of of Deputy Registration
of Wire bars Village. for one year and the Counties
Order of the Court aforesaid before
Deputy Commissioners.
to.

Stamp Duty not affixed

26

12-12-91

1-1-86

(1)

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.
PETITION DEPARTMENT.
REGD. NO. 4618R
DATE 11-12-91

Counsel

17-7-

[illegible] 24—4—91 [illegible]

[illegible] 1877/78 [illegible]

[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	20 [illegible]	~~[illegible]~~	[illegible]			28-4—	"	28-4—

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 30.9.91

[illegible] 10.11.91

[illegible] (4HF91)

[illegible] (104)

[illegible] 0—2—4

[illegible] 0—0—4

[illegible] 0—2—4.

(True Extract)

[signature] 12.11.91

Revenue Sheristadar
District Office
Shimoga

[illegible]

30-

No 29 Q

(3)

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

LR 150-91-2

The accompanying Petition No. 4618

dated 8-12-91 received at the

Dewan's Office from Hanumiah alias Hanumanth, Hire Inam, Honnali Taluk, praying that he may be confirmed as Patel of Horebasur

Revenue file Papers to 4618 27/12/92

is forwarded, together with its nil enclosures, to the Deputy Commissioner Shimoga for submission of Report on the facts of the case and on the merits after taking in the petitioner & the latter should be returned

By Order,

Dy Chief Secy 14/12/92

Chief Secretary.

BANGALORE, 16 June 1892.

W N

Ended accordingly

(General Serial No. 30.) 932

1892.

From The Dy Commissioner
Shimoga District

(4)

To

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan
of Mysore

Dated 22d July 192.

Despatched 22

Received 25

Enclosures No. 1 Hearn File &
1 petition with its enclosure

General No.
No.

With reference to Chief Secretary's Official Memo No 29 of the 16th June 192 Submits report with records in connection with the Petition of Hammaiga alias Hammantaya, Hirebasur, Honnali Taluk, praying that he may be confirmed as Patel

Perm. B. Issue 25/7

To the case No. 4.

P.T. 17-9-92 1-2-1892

With reference to the Despatch
the Dy Commr -
I beg to submit
after a further careful
search made the records
of 1872 relating to
the appointment of
the appellant as
the Patel of Hod-
humeeja,
or to show clear proof
of the records having
been destroyed - These
records are material
to the present case. As
also the Pattika Boligi
Settlement records,
which should also
be traced & sub-
mitted
The V. papers are
returned for reference
& submission
RO
Dy Comr

32

Deputy Commissioner's Office
Shimoga District

No. 41 In Verm
Filed 1 petition with

22d. July 1892. Shimoga.

(4)

To

The Chief Secretary to the
Dewan of Mysore

Sir,

With reference to your Official Memorandum No. 29 dated 16th. ultimo forwarding a petition from Hanamaiya of Hirebasûr for report with proceedings I have the honor to state that Seekaiya was the Hakdar Patél of Hirebasûr village, Honnali Taluk. -

2. He died many years ago — leaving two sons named Dodda = Hanumaiya and Sanna-Hanumaiya, both of whom were minors at the time of the death of their father.

3. In 1871 at the request of the Patél who was admittedly sick and unable to do the work, the Amildar recommended that his eldest son

Dodda-Hanumaiya might be appointed Patél and as he was an illiterate person, the Patél's nephew Hanamaiya alias Hanumantaiya (Petitioner) directed to officiate as his gumasta.

4. The Deputy Commissioner directed the Amildar to allow Hanumanta to do the work pending orders to a reference made to the Superintendent of the Division. Vide Deputy Comm's order No. 13 dated 13th March 1872.

5. No reference is available as to what further order was passed in the case, the records having been destroyed. Any how Hanumantaiya had been doing the duties of the office ever since the order quoted above.

6. The Amildar in his report No. 397 dated 22d August 1890 states

that the Potgi Baraward contains

the following particulars. —"

"Seekappa died, his son Hammaiya

was appointed (to succeed). His

gumasta is Hammantaiya." —

Dodda-Hammaiya died since, —

leaving 3 sons viz 1 Rangappa, 2

Giriappa and 3 Timmaiya. The

eldest Rangappa put in a petition

on the 18th August 1891 that he —

might be appointed Patél in

succession to his father, and in the

course of enquiry deposed that as

he was illiterate, his brother No. 2

Giriappa who could read and write

might be appointed Patél. The 3rd

son Timmaiya had no objection

to his elder brother's suggestion -

Consequently Giriappa was appointed

Patél on the 15th September 1891 when

Petitioner ceased to be the gumasta

7. The Petitioner Hanumaiya now alleges that in the "Pal-patti" exe=cuted by the original Hakdar Seekappa, it is stated that the Patili office should go to the Petitioner and the Inmbali lands to his eldest son Dodda Hanumaiya and solicits that he may be confirmed as Patél

8. The records shew that Petitioner enjoys a share in the Inmbali lands. He made no mention of the "Pal-patti" before, nor produced at the time of the enquiry. He was offered a chance to continue to act as gumasta for some time more, but he declined to avail himself of it.

9. The Petition with its enclosure received is herewith returned together with the records relating to the case.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant

Abdul Rahiman Khan Bahadur
By Commissioner Mysore &c

86.

(General Serial No. 30.)

189 .

From

The Chief Secretary
to the Dewan of Mysore.

To

The Deputy Commr
Shimoga dt.

Dated 23rd
Despatched 24
Received } Septr 1892.

Enclosures No. 1 file of proceedings and petition with its enclosure

General No. 4775
Petn No. 172-92

Calling for papers relating to the appointment of Ramanaiya alias Ramanayya as Gowda of Ramanaiya Kere Gowda of Ramanaiya, Kasba of Sorab Taluk.

References to be marked.

From the Deputy Commr Shimoga No 1020 & 28/92
978

To
The Deputy Comm^r,
Shimoga District.

His letter No. L.S. Genl 401 dated, submitting report on the petition of Ramanaiya alias Ramanthaya of Sirebadur village, Honnali taluk, praying to be confirmed in, the office of the said village.

With reference to the above, I have honour to report that the D.y. Comm^r will either submit after a further enquiry made by the records of his relating to the appointment of the applicant as Amanta of the Ramanaiya, or ~~Certify~~ Certify that the records have been destroyed. The records are material to the

39

(General Serial No. 30.)

1898, 53 8235

From, The Deputy Commissioner
Kadur District

(6)

To

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan
of Mysore.

Dated 25th January 1853

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No. 1. Papers re forest-

General No. 1511 Kadur

No. 978 3/1-53.

Submitting his Report
No 4775 3 Registered
Report 172 that the Head
Clerk Register of the Sub
Office has certified to the
fact that the Records
of 1852 relating to the
Application of the
Office have been delivered
from the Manager of
Koodoor Village, Kadur
District have been destroyed

Returned Nov 30/1

31/1/98

Re [illegible] Nanaga District

Surveyor's office

Cape Town 26th January 1875.

(6)

To

The Chief Secretary to the

Government of Cape Town.

Sir,

In returning the Memorandum

Records & the Petition with

its enclosure, received with your

Circular No 4/75 dated 23rd Instant

last, I have the honor to report

that the Memorandum Book & Records

of the Court of Office have certified

to the fact that the memorandum in

relation to the appointment of the

Kaffalaar Commando by Order

Government, have been destroyed.

The Deputy Resident Settlement

Records of the Talook, referred to

have been mislaid, have

not been found in the Talook,

though a further search has

been lately been made.

The Petition refers that,

Whereas by, [illegible]

at the time of the Public Petge
Settlement, relating ---- to
the enquiry at the Office of Patel
in question -

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedient servant
Abdul Rahman, Khan Bahadur
by Commissioner

BM

42

(General Serial No. 30.)

189

(7)

From

The Chief Secretary
to the Dewan of Mysore.

To

The Superintendent of
Revenue Survey.

Dated

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No.

General No. 17482
Fd. No. 172-92

Calling for the Kotagi
Settlement-papers of the village
of Nirebasur, Honnali Taluk.

References to be marked.

Mysore Govt. C. Press, Bangalore.—9-1-93.—3,000.

To

The Superintendent
of Revenue Survey.

Sir, I am ~~directed~~ to state that the Deputy of Nanaja appeals in the matter of ~~his~~ ~~The Survey Superintendent~~ ~~is requested to be good enough~~ ~~to transmit to this office, the~~ Kotgi Settlement papers of the ~~village of Hirebasur~~ Honnali Taluk, for reference in connection with the appeal of Hanumaiya ~~alias~~ Hanumantaiya of Hirebasur, regarding the Patels of the said village, have been received, and I request therefore that you will be pleased to cause the settlement papers of the Patels of Hirebasur, which you have in your office, to be sent to this office as early as possible.

By Order

Draft
(Councillor's order)

S.N.

for Chief Secretary.

44

No. 47. 12822

1893. Pet. 525

From The Superintendent Revenue Survey

To The Chief Secretary to the ~~The Revenue Survey,~~ Government of Mysore.

Dated 3rd Regulars
Despatched 4th Mar. 93
Received. 6/11/93

Enclosures No.

General No. 1089 } 1893.
No.

Chief Secretary's Docket
No. 1743 of the 3rd Instant
& 172-92

Begs to forward, as requested, the accompanying Papers as per List attached relative to the settlement of the Patta of the Lands of Hirebidur, Honnali Taluk and to request that the same may kindly be returned when no longer required.

Superintendent Revenue Survey

Petition Nov 5/5

216 - - - 7

Directed to Record - Receive enclosures with regret & the information available is enclosed Statement -
6/11/93

Continued & resubmitted.
MGH

Rec'd 6/11/93.

(General Serial No. 30.)

1893.

From

The Chief Secretary
to the Dewan of Mysore.

To

The Superintendent Engineering Survey

Dated 12 June -

Despatched 15

Received

Enclosures No. 4.

General No. 723

Pol. F. No. 172-92

His Secretariat No 1150 dated 4th May 1893 -

Has the honor to return herewith the papers noted in the Enclosure of the Chief Engineer on the Survey Branch, received with the above

By Order

Chief Secretary

References to be marked.

467

Before the Government of *His Highness* the Maharaja of Mysore.

Appeal No. 211 of 1891-92.

Appellant. Vs. Respondents.

Hanumia alias Hanumanthia
of Hirebasur, Tumkur District,
represented by his Manager
Singri Advocate.

1. Rangappa
2. Giriyappa
3. Hanumanthia
represented by his G.
Ramaswamy Iyengar
Advocate.

Decision, dated 21st June 1893.

In March 1891 Veerappa the
brother Patel of Hirebasur, died while he
was of his office and it was
recommended that his eldest son Hanu-
miah who was illiterate, might be appointed
Patel and that his younger brothers con
Hanumanthia might be admitted to
do duties as Gumasthas. Hanumanthia
was accordingly ordered to do duties —
pending further orders. Hanumiah died
leaving three minor sons the Respondents
the 2nd & 3rd on attaining majority claimed

the

the office and the Deputy Commissioner of Chinaja Division ordered on 1891 that Appellant Ramamurthi be removed from office and that Respondent Govindan should be appointed Patel on probation. Ramamurthi appealed on the ground that he was duly elected as Pandyar in his own right in succession of a certain family and that Govindan his paternal uncle made over the Patelship to him and not as Pumacta, the post for decision in which Respondent did but as Pumacta or Pandyar. On a petition dated 5th January 1892 presented personally to the Commissioner, Ramamurthi stated as follows "by analogous Kostaipu during his life-time, about 18 years ago, gave a petition and gave a deposition requesting that his son should be appointed Patel and

that

that the duties should devolve upon me as Gomashta. In accordance with the same, ever since, I have been doing the duties, but Seshagiri has fraudulently obtained the appointment to the effect that the office should be conferred on him and taken away from me. He does not write. Seshagiri has declared that my Gomashtaship should never be taken away." [illegible] This conduct of Seshagiri was doing duties not as the Gomashta to the Cutcherry of the Collector. Therefore no reason to set aside the order of the Acting Commissioner appealed against. The appeal is rejected.

11/7/93

Sd/ [illegible]

Rd draft

Sd/ [illegible]

Acting Commissioner.

Colr

724 & 17 — 1/7/93.

Pet F. 172-92

Copy to the Acting Commissioner, Shortland District, in the Pernambuco papers received with his letter No 1020/978 dated 25th January 1893.

"By Ord"

Chief Secretary.

RM

SN

WM

under the head 'Father
-dears".

Nica

present case as also the Pakka Potisi settlement records which should also be traced and submitted.

2. The connected papers received with the above are herewith returned for reference & resubmission.

By order

Draft

Asst
27/8/22
Under Secy

Ph 1/

50. 2-5-2 days — 17-7-93

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,
PETITION DEPARTMENT,
June 1893

No. 21/4618-

Lr 160-91-92

17-7-

(12)

Endorsement granted to Hanumia alias Hanumantiah of Hiribasur, Honnali Taluk,

in reply to his Petition Registered No. 4618 dated 8th December 1891 appealing against the order of the Deputy Commissioner of Shimoga dated 5th Sept. 1891 directing the appointment of Gowda as Patel of Hiribasur in place of petitioner.

Petitioner is informed that his appeal has been dismissed, as there is no reason for setting aside the order of the Deputy Commissioner. Appellant, according to his own admission, was a Jumasta and not the Huckdar Patel.

2. The enclosure is returned.

17/7/93

"By Order"

Re-draft.

17

Chief Secretary.

Mysore Govt. Central Press, Bangalore,—9-2-93—2000.